

receiving a request over the Internet from said first party for said gift to be sent to said second party;

obtaining over the Internet from said first party a pseudonym of said second party;

securing over the Internet a non-pseudonymous name and address associated with the second party's pseudonym; and

producing computer output enabling said gift to be sent to said second party while said non-pseudonymous name is not revealed to said first party.

16. (Twice Amended) The method of claim 1, further including the step of electronically charging a first fee to said first party.

17. (Twice Amended) The method of claim 16, further including the step of electronically charging a second fee to said first party, wherein said second fee is related to the value of said gift.

## II. REMARKS

Respectfully, and generally for the reasons set forth below, the objections and rejections and each ground therefor are traversed.

### A. Paragraphs of Objections and/or Rejections

#### 1. Paragraph 1 of the Office Action

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner has acknowledged that the Amendment overcomes the art of record, for which Applicant is appreciative.

#### 2. Paragraph 2 of the Office Action

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-6, 11-

18, and 30-33 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 101. The Examiner contends that these claims are based on disclosure that is not enabling.

In response, the base claim 1 has been amended to make utility more apparent. The Examiner's mentioned "tangible and concrete" are not mentioned in the statute.

**3. Paragraph 3 of the Office Action**

In paragraph 3, the Examiner has objected to informalities in claims 1 and 17.

In response, the foregoing amendment corrects the informalities.

**4. Paragraph 4 of the Office Action**

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-18 and 30-32 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, first paragraph. The Examiner contends that these claims are based on disclosure that is not enabling.

In response, Applicant retained Professor Lee Hollaar and hereby submits his Declaration as evidence to the contrary. The Declaration of Professor Lee Hollaar, who is a professor of computer science, is evidence that one with less than ordinary skill (e.g., no experience) could make and use the invention based on the patent application and with no undue experimentation:

"if such a student were given the disclosure of this application as a programming assignment in one of my software development courses or the like, that student would be able to implement the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In fact, many programming assignments do not include the level of detail of the disclosure in this application, and yet students are expected to (and routinely do) complete those assignments without difficulty."

The application meets the requirements of Sec. 112.

**5. Paragraph 5 of the Office Action**

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 16 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner contends that the limitation of "including... sent" has insufficient antecedent bases.

In response, the claim has been amended to overcome the rejection.

**6. Paragraphs 6-9 of the Office Action**

In paragraphs 6-9 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected 1-4, 10-12, 19, 28-29 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102, and claims 13-14, 16, and 20 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103, both based on contentions pertaining to Kelly 6,306,035.

In response, Kelly is not prior art; the cited portions in the Office Action do not appear in Kelly's parent 5,816,918.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's noting that there is allowable subject matter in paragraph 10.

**III. Conclusion**

The Examiner also has graciously provided numerous ways to communicate regarding the instant case, and the Applicant and undersigned are most appreciative. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set out below if it can in any way expedite or facilitate issuance of a patent on the application.

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested. Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned at the address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

March 7, 2002



Peter K. Trzyńa  
(Reg. No. 32,601)

P.O. Box 7131  
Chicago, IL 60680-7131

(312) 240-0824